

Please note, these transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

SUSTAINABILITY AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA, JR., CALEPA BUILDING

1001 I STREET

2ND FLOOR

COASTAL HEARING ROOM

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 2003

1:30 P.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 10063

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Cheryl Peace, Member

Carl Washington, Member

STAFF

Julie Nauman, Chief Deputy Director

Marie Carter, Acting Chief Counsel

Patty Wohl, Deputy Director

Boons Baythavong

Steve Boyd

Jan Howard

Mary Madison-Johnson

Kathy Marsh

Joyce Mason

Cara Morgan

Trevor O'Shaughnessy

Dana Papke

Edgar Rojas

Brenda Smith

Steve Sorelle

Steve Uselton

Barbara Van Gee

Lorraine Van Kekerix

Please note, these transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

iii

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

ALSO PRESENT

Chuck Helget, Allied Waste Industries

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

| INDEX | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Roll Call And Declaration Of Quorum | 1 |
| A. Waste Prevention And Market Development Deputy Director's Report | 1 |
| B. Consideration Of Amendments To The Original Scope Of Work For The Motion Picture Industry Sustainability Contract (Tire Recycling Management Fund, Reallocation, FY 2002/2003) -- (June Board Item 1) | 4 |
| Motion | 5 |
| Vote | 5 |
| C. Consideration Of The Application To Renew The Oakland/Berkeley Recycling Market Development Zone Designation -- (June Board Item 2) | 6 |
| Motion | 9 |
| Vote | 9 |
| D. Consideration And Approval Of Contractor For The RecycleStore.com Marketing Services Contract (FY 2002/2003 Contract Concept #14) -- (Budget & Administration Committee Item B And June Board Item 3) | 10 |
| Motion | 13 |
| Vote | 13 |
| E. Consideration Of Completion Of 1997-1999 Rigid Plastic Packaging Container (RPPC) Compliance Agreements For The Following Companies: (1) Airosol Company; (2) American Tool Companies, Incorporated; (3) Blue Cross Laboratories; (4) Core Products Company, Incorporated; (5) C.R. Laurence Company, Incorporated; (6) DSC Products, Incorporated; (7) Eagle One Industries (An Operating Unit Of The Valvoline Company, A Division of Ashland Corporation); (8) Empire Cleaning Supply; (9) Foam Seal, Incorporated; (10) Goodyear Replacement Products; (11) Holland Manufacturing Company; (12) J.F. Daley International, Ltd.; (13) Palmer Paint Products, Incorporated; (14) Walter G. Legge Company, Incorporated -- (June Board Item 4) | 14 |
| Motion | 15 |
| Vote | 15 |

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

| | |
|---|----|
| F. Consideration Of California State University Chico As Contractor For The Post Consumer Resin (PCR) Quality Assurance And Testing Protocol Project (IWMA Fund, FY 2002/2003 Contract Concept No. 15) -- (Budget & Administration Committee Item C And June Board Item 5) | 15 |
| Motion | 18 |
| Vote | 18 |
| G. Consideration Of The Scope Of Work And The Department Of Finance As Contractor For Compliance Audits Of The State Agency Buy Recycled Campaign, The Recycled-Content Newsprint Program, The Plastic Trash Bag Program, And The Rigid Plastic Packaging Container Program (Fiscal Year 2002/03 Contract Concept Number 42, BCP#2, and 5-Year Tire Plan) -- (Budget & Administration Committee Item D And June Board Item 6) | 18 |
| H. Consideration Of Contractor For The State Green Lodging Contract (FY 2002-03 Contract Concept No. 22) -- (Budget & Administration Committee Item E And June Board Item 7) | 21 |
| Motion | 22 |
| Vote | 23 |
| I. Consideration Of The Final Report For The Building Material Emissions Study (Integrated Waste Management Account, FY 2000/2001, Contract Concept Number 54, And Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Account, FY 1999/2000, BCP Finance Letter Number 3, And Waste Tire Management Program Funds, FY 2001/2002, Contract Concept Number 95) -- (June Board Item 8) | 23 |
| J. Diversion, Planning And Local Development Deputy Director's Report | 34 |
| K. Item Deleted | 36 |

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

| | |
|--|----|
| L. Consideration Of The Application For A SB 1066 Time Extension By The City Of Redondo Beach, County Of Los Angeles -- (June Board Item 11) | 36 |
| M. Consideration Of Staff Recommendation On The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Following Jurisdictions: Nevada County: Grass Valley, Nevada City -- (June Board Item 12) | 44 |
| Motion | 46 |
| Vote | 46 |
| N. Consideration Of Board Staff's Alternative Daily Cover Investigation Starting In Summer 2002 As It Relates To Claiming Diversion For Use Of Alternative Daily Cover At Kirby Canyon Landfill (SWIS# 43-AN-0008), Hay Road/B&J Landfill (SWIS# 48-AA-0002), Tri Cities Landfill (SWIS# 01-AA-0008), Altamont Landfill (SWIS# 01-AA-0009), Vasco Road Landfill (SWIS# 01-AA-0010), Pacheco Pass Landfill (SWIS# 43-AA-0004), Forward, Inc. Landfill (SWIS# 39-AA-0015) and Newby Island Landfill (SWIS# 43-AN-0003) -- (June Board Item 13) | 46 |
| Motion | 61 |
| Vote | 62 |
| O. Consideration Of Contract Concept, Scope Of Work, And The Department Of Food And Agriculture As Contractor For The Food Waste Diversion At California Fairs Contract (FY 2002/2003 Integrated Waste Management Account Fund) -- (Budget & Administration Committee Item F And June Board Item 14) | 62 |
| Motion | 66 |
| Vote | 66 |
| Public Comment | 67 |
| Adjournment | 67 |
| Reporter's Certificate | 68 |

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: The meeting is
3 called to order.

4 Secretary, call the roll.

5 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

6 Peace?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Here.

8 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Washington?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Here.

10 All right. We have the Waste Prevention and
11 Market Development Deputy's report.

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Good afternoon, chair
13 Washington and Committee members.

14 I have a couple of things -- this is Patty Wohl
15 from the Waste Prevention and Market Development Division.

16 I have several things I'd like to report on this
17 morning -- this afternoon. The first being on this agenda
18 this afternoon you'll be considering an item regarding
19 materials emissions testing that my Sustainable Building
20 Section conducted recently. Since our test results will
21 be the first publicly available product performance
22 information of its kind for classroom applications,
23 several school districts are anxiously awaiting the data
24 to see if it's reasonable for them to expect low emitting
25 environmentally preferable products from the marketplace.

1 So depending on the outcome of the CIWMB study,
2 most notable is the Los Angeles Unified School District,
3 which is poised and ready to specify that their next 45
4 school construction projects actively pursue the low
5 emitting building materials credits points, which are
6 under the CHPS, Collaborative for High Performance
7 Schools.

8 So they anticipate holding meetings with three or
9 more major product manufacturers in each of these material
10 categories to tell them that they plan to use the Section
11 1350 specifications and give the manufacturers and
12 opportunity to demonstrate compliance with that section.

13 The district is welcoming the Board's
14 participation in this truly market transformation effort.
15 And I plan to update you periodically on their progress.

16 In addition, speaking of CHPS, I wanted to let
17 you know that the Sacramento Bee ran two very favorable
18 articles on the Collaborative for High Performance
19 Schools. One featured the Truckee -- the Tahoe-Truckee
20 Middle School, which is a grant recipient of the
21 California Energy Commission's demonstration schools.
22 Because of an interagency agreement that the Board
23 approved with the Commission, we have been actively
24 engaged in this project, especially in the area of
25 material specifications.

1 The Energy Commissioner Parnell, who Chairs the
2 CHPS Board, where our Chair, Linda Moulton-Patterson is
3 also a member of that board, was quoted extensively in the
4 article showing his support for high performance schools
5 that transcend energy, efficiency, and optimize learning
6 and student performance. To that end the Commissioner is
7 quoted saying, "Our concept is that all students
8 regardless of their socioeconomic status should have the
9 benefit of one of these schools." And I think we'd all
10 concur with that.

11 In addition, I wanted to mention a couple things
12 that the Zone staff has been working on. We just had a
13 zone administrator training on June 5th and 6th. It was a
14 two-day training with a focus on innovations in brown
15 field redevelopment. Brown fields exist in many zones,
16 and given the right economic and community circumstances
17 can be a viable development project to undertake, as they
18 can create new jobs as well as new sources of revenue. So
19 we're excited about that project.

20 And then, in addition, we will be holding an
21 investor forum June 26th and 27th in Oakland. Our
22 contractor, Materials for the Future, managed to get an
23 invitation to a sponsored event by Golden State Capital
24 Network, which is a forum that attracts 75 to 100
25 investors and venture capitalists. And what we will be

1 providing them is five recycling businesses that will
2 prevent their case study -- or present their case studies
3 there. And then these "angel" investors can decide if
4 they want to invest in these companies. So it's a good
5 opportunity for us to grow some of these recycling
6 businesses, so we're excited about that.

7 So with that, that concludes my report.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: All right.

9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Do you want to move right
10 into the agenda?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Let's go right into
12 the agenda.

13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Okay. Agenda Item 1,
14 which is Committee Item B, consideration of amendments to
15 the original scope of work for the Motion Picture
16 Industry's Sustainability Contract will be presented by
17 Brenda Smith.

18 MS. SMITH: Good afternoon, Board members.

19 This one may look a little familiar to you. A
20 Couple months ago, at the April Board meeting, you
21 approved UCLA as the contractor and the scope of work for
22 the Motion Picture Sustainability Project.

23 This item today is looking at consideration of
24 amendments to that scope of work. And these amendments
25 are underlined in your scope of work. They are simply

1 specifics on tire-related tasks. And this is because at
2 the May Board meeting \$20,000 from the Tire Reallocation
3 Fund was additionally added to this project.

4 There are three options for the Board to
5 consider. And, that is, to approve the amendments for the
6 tire-related tasks; or to approve the amendments with
7 specific modifications that you may want; or to take no
8 action, which would revert the \$20,000 back to the tire
9 fund.

10 And staff is recommending Option 1 and passage of
11 Resolution 2003-348.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Great. Thank you.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I have no problem with
14 that.

15 Okay. Thank you.

16 With that I would like to move Resolution Number
17 2003-348, consideration of amendments to the original
18 scope of work for the Motion Picture Industry
19 Sustainability Contract (Tire Recycling Management Fund
20 Reallocation, Fiscal Year 2002/2003).

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Thank you.

22 Second.

23 Secretary, call the roll.

24 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Peace?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Aye.

1 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Washington?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Aye.

3 All right.

4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Agenda Item 2, which is
5 Committee Item C, consideration of the application to
6 renew the Oakland/Berkeley Recycling Market Development
7 Zone designation.

8 And Joyce Mason will present.

9 MS. MASON: Good afternoon, members of the
10 Committee.

11 Oakland/Berkeley RMDZ. Today I'd like to tell
12 you why staff recommends a ten-year renewal among your
13 three options.

14 The Oakland/Berkeley has been one of our most
15 active zones, and I believe there's two real reasons for
16 this. First, a local recycling ethic and commitment to
17 waste prevention, recycling, and market development. And,
18 second, excellent leveraging of state and local resources.
19 I'd like to just share a couple more bits about each of
20 these points.

21 On local commitment the cities of Oakland and
22 Berkeley leaders in that they integrate their commitment
23 into their day-to-day resources. Two examples:

24 It's the only one of our zones -- or one of our
25 few zones to have hired a full-time RMDZ zone

1 administrator, showing that they put our program way on
2 top. And it's the only RMDZ to obtain the services of an
3 economic gardening consultant simultaneously with our own
4 RMDZ pilot program at the state level for this innovative
5 economic development tool that our RMDZ businesses can
6 use.

7 And, secondly, on the point of leveraging
8 resources, Oakland/Berkeley is one of the two RMDZs in
9 Alameda County, and in 1990 Alameda County passed Measure
10 D, the Alameda County Waste Reduction and Recycling
11 Initiative. And because of this, the jurisdiction --

12 CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR NAUMAN: Excuse me. Could
13 you just slow down a tiny bit. The Court reporter's
14 having difficulty keeping up with you.

15 MS. MASON: Sorry. I've been told before that I
16 speak a little fast for court reporters. Sorry about
17 that.

18 They have a goal because of this Measure D --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: He's supposed to be
20 pretty good. I heard he was good. Now I find out the
21 truth here.

22 MS. MASON: Up to the test.

23 They have a goal to divert 75 percent of their
24 waste from landfills by 2010, exceeding our state mandate
25 of 50 percent by 2000, and reaching toward the Board's new

1 vision of zero waste.

2 And in real terms what Measure D does, it
3 increases funding for many waste prevention and recycling
4 related programs, which enables the locals to leverage the
5 technical and financial resources we have at the state
6 level, which was the original intent of the RMDZ's local
7 and state partnership. So while many zones during their
8 ten-year period have decreased their resources over time,
9 Oakland/Berkeley is fortunate to have increased many of
10 them.

11 I won't repeat what was already in the item in
12 terms of all the statistics except to say that combined
13 the businesses receiving technical and financial
14 assistance from the program have diverted over 215,000
15 tons per year from landfills. They have ate our RMDZ
16 loans and they've expanded 13 -- where it started 13 new
17 or expanded businesses and created 137 jobs.

18 Last, but not least, I just want to say that if I
19 were to characterize this zone, it would be with the
20 expression "variety is the spice," because we have the
21 only mattress recycler in California in this zone; we have
22 a custom deconstruction wood mill that takes old mill
23 wood, replanes it into new wood for construction and
24 renovation projects; and we have custom high-end glass art
25 work; and last, but not least, on counter tops, a custom

1 counter manufacturer; and last, but not least, a reuse
2 facility everybody's heard of, Urban Ore, which in its own
3 way is an urban legend and a recycling trailblazer.

4 So because of these results staff recommends that
5 the Board approve Option 1 and adopt Resolution 2003-327,
6 renewing the Oakland/Berkeley Zone for another ten years.

7 Thank you. And please let my know if you have
8 any questions.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: No, thank you very
10 much.

11 Any questions, Mrs. Peace?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: No, I think it's
13 wonderful that this zone bunches effectively and gets a
14 lot of local support. This is what this program's all
15 about, and it's wonderful.

16 And with that I would like to move Resolution
17 Number 2003-327, consideration of the application to renew
18 Oakland/Berkeley Recycling Market Development Zone
19 designation.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Second.

21 We have a motion and a second.

22 We will substitute the previous roll call.

23 Thank you.

24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: And just for the record,
25 both 1 and 2 would be on consent then?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yes, ma'am.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Okay. So Agenda Item 3,
3 D, consideration and approval of contractor for the
4 RecycleStore.com Marketing Services Contract.

5 And Steve Boyd will present.

6 MR. BOYD: Good afternoon, Committee members.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Steve, you guys are
8 all over the place, huh. That's great, man. I was
9 talking to some people in New Orleans and they mentioned
10 your store. That's pretty good.

11 MR. BOYD: Very good. Love to hear that.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, pretty good.
13 All right.

14 MR. BOYD: Well, if you think we're all over the
15 place right now, you just wait a couple months.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I can imagine.

17 MR. BOYD: This item recommends a contractor for
18 RecycleStore.com Marketing Services. And since its
19 implementation RecycleStore.com has aided recycled content
20 product manufacturers in their product marketing
21 challenges. The recycleStore Internet catalogue has
22 generated sales an associated diverted recycled materials
23 for recycled content product manufacturers located in the
24 Board's Recycling Market Development Zones.

25 With over 350 recycled content products,

1 RecycleStore.com has become a valuable marketing tool,
2 both for the consumer and the manufacturer. Like the
3 recycled content products that it serves, RecycleStore.com
4 needs marketing to achieve its potential.

5 In August 2002, the Board approved a \$60,000
6 contract concept for professional RecycleStore.com
7 marketing services. In March of 2003 the Board approved
8 the associated scope of work. A request for proposals was
9 advertised on March 28th of this year, and submittals came
10 in on May 13.

11 At the time this agenda item was prepared the
12 review team was in the process of scoring the proposals.
13 We now have a recommended marketing contractor for this
14 project. Making Ideas Happen is a marketing firm located
15 in Woodland Hills, California, that presented the required
16 qualifications and experience, along with a winning
17 detailed plan, to introduce RecycleStore.com to the
18 nation.

19 The bid price to the Board was 57,500, well
20 within our budget.

21 The firm has successfully completed similar
22 projects and is recognized for its environmental
23 relationships and achievements.

24 If the Committee would like more detail on the
25 proposal and scoring criteria, I would be glad to provide

1 more information. If not, staff recommends Option 1,
2 approval of Making Ideas Happen as the contractor for
3 RecycleStore.com Marketing Services, and requests approval
4 of Resolution 2003-328.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: And can I add that that
6 would be revised to include the contractor and the cost.
7 They're not in the original resolution.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah. And
9 certainly I -- you know, let me tell you that Making
10 Things Happen is certainly -- they really have proven
11 themselves across the globe in putting -- in marketing
12 people. And I think that -- you're absolutely right, I
13 think they'll do an excellent job for our RecycleStore and
14 getting it out there to the nation. And I just want you
15 to know that you've a pretty good job yourself, Steve, in
16 making that happen.

17 MR. BOYD: Well, thank you. There was a lot of
18 other people behind it.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: All right. Any
20 questions, Mrs. Peace?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Yes. So MIH isn't
22 creating a whole new website; they're just marketing the
23 one that we already have.

24 MR. BOYD: That's correct.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay. I just have a

1 question here. It says they're going to provide mass
2 media print and videocommunications and celebrity
3 endorsements. They're going to do that all for \$60,000?

4 MR. BOYD: Yes. We actually have three targets.
5 We have buyers for retail merchandisers, we have
6 government procurement officers, and we have the general
7 consumers. The good part about this particular contract
8 and contractor is is that they already have established
9 relationships with those three target audiences. So we're
10 not getting a lot of R&D activity in there. We're just
11 getting a lot of bang for our buck.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay. Thank you.

13 Okay. I guess with that I would like to move
14 Resolution Number 2003-328 revised, consideration and
15 approval of contractor for the RecycleStore.com Marketing
16 Services Contract, Fiscal Year 2002-2003, Contract Concept
17 Number 14.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Second.

19 And we'll substitute the previous roll call.

20 And That will be placed on consent.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Actually I believe that
22 one has to be fiscal consent.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Fiscal consent.
24 I'm sorry. Yes.

25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: So Agenda Item 4,

1 Committee Item E, consideration of completion of the
2 1997-'99 Rigid Plastic Packaging Container (RPPC)
3 Compliance Agreements for the following companies: And
4 there's 14 companies.

5 And Jan Howard will present.

6 MS. HOWARD: Prior to moving on with staff's
7 recommendation I would first like to provide you with the
8 update on the status of Airosol Company and Blue Cross
9 Laboratories.

10 Airosol submitted documentation that it is in
11 compliance by source reducing the amount of resin it uses
12 by more than 18 percent. And Blue Cross submitted
13 documentation that it uses more than 25 percent
14 post-consumer resin in two of its regulated containers and
15 source reduced the amount of resin in its remaining
16 containers by 18 percent.

17 With that, staff recommends the Committee approve
18 the companies as listed under Option 1, 2, and 5, and
19 recommends the Committee -- and adopt Resolutions 2003-330
20 through 2003-343.

21 This concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to
22 answer any questions.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Thank you.

24 Any questions, Ms. Peace?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: No, I don't have any

1 questions.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: All right. With
3 that, I'll move adoption of Resolution 2003-330 through
4 2003-334 for consideration for the completion of '97 --

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: 343.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: 343.

7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Right.

8 Right.

9 -- for the following companies that are listed
10 within that resolution number.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Second.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: We have a second by
13 Ms. Peace.

14 And we'll substitute the previous roll call.

15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: And that one would be on
16 consent.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: And that's consent.

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Okay. Agenda Item 5,
19 Committee Item F, consideration of California State
20 University Chico as contractor for the Post Consumer Resin
21 (PCR) Quality Assurance and Testing Protocol Project.

22 And Edgar Rojas will present.

23 MR. ROJAS: Good afternoon, Committee members.

24 I'm Edgar Rojas with the Plastic Recycling
25 Technology Section. I'm here to present Committee Item F,

1 consideration of California State University Chico as
2 contractor for the Post Consumer Resin Quality Assurance
3 and Testing Protocol Project.

4 At a January 2003 meeting, the Board adopted
5 Resolution 2003-29, approving the scope of work for this
6 contract. Then at its April 2003 meeting, after knowing
7 that staff did not get any bids in for the request for
8 proposal, the Board directed the staff to work with
9 colleges and universities on an interagency agreement and
10 increase the dollars, if necessary, from the 25,000 that
11 was initially allocated to the project.

12 As directed by the Board, staff investigated
13 researchers in the California State University that had
14 experience, expertise in equipment necessary to perform
15 the contract. Based upon this investigation staff found
16 that California State University Chico was uniquely
17 qualified for doing this specific type of project because
18 of its longstanding involvement in plastics research and
19 adequate testing and manufacturing equipment.

20 Staff also interviewed Dr. Joseph Green, who
21 would be the principal researcher for this project, in was
22 impressed of his professional background in plastics
23 research and development.

24 There has been a lot of stakeholder interest in
25 this project. In a meeting with the staff, several

1 representatives of the plastics industry brought up some
2 concerns about their level of participation in the
3 project. Specifically they want to participate in the
4 project by providing information, specifications, testing
5 and consulting services, and technical expertise.

6 To provide industry stakeholders an opportunity
7 to express concerns, staff would hold a meeting in July
8 with the researcher and technical representatives of the
9 plastics industry.

10 Regarding funding for this project, BCP Number 2
11 allocated 247,000 for RPPC support. Since not all of the
12 money originally allocated for this purpose, which
13 includes the annual suitable processors for 25,000, and
14 administration law judges would be needed this year staff
15 is adding an additional 40,000 to the original 25,000, for
16 the total of 65,000.

17 Staff recommends that the Board approves Option 1
18 and adopt Resolution 2003-344. In Option 1 staff requests
19 the Board to approve the California State University
20 Chico, Department of Mechanical Engineering and
21 Manufacturing, as the contractor to carry out the Post
22 Consumer Resin Quality Assurance and Testing Protocol
23 Project.

24 This concludes my presentation.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Thank you.

1 Ms. Peace.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I have no
3 questions.

4 Okay. With that I'd like to move Resolution
5 Number 2003-344, consideration of California State
6 University Chico as contractor for the Post Consumer Resin
7 Quality Assurance AND Testing Protocol Project (IWMA Fund,
8 Fiscal Year 2002/2003 Contract Concept Number 15).

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Second.

10 And we'll substitute the previous roll call.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: And that would be on
12 fiscal consent.

13 Agenda Item 6, Committee Item G, is consideration
14 of the scope of work and the Department of Finance as
15 contractor for compliance audits of the state agency
16 Buy-Recycled Campaign, the Recycled-Content Newsprint
17 Program, the Plastic Trash Bag Program, and the Rigid
18 Plastic Packaging Container Program.

19 And Kathy Marsh will present.

20 MS. MARSH: Good afternoon, Board members.

21 I am here to present Item G, the consideration of
22 the scope of work --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Just a second
24 before you --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Excuse me. I've been

1 told I might have a potential conflict of interest on
2 this, so I need to recuse myself and leave the room.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Consideration of
4 the scope of work and the Department of Finance as
5 contractor for compliance audits for the state agency
6 Buy-Recycled Campaign, Recycled-content Newsprint, Plastic
7 Trash Bag, and the Rigid Plastic Packaging Container
8 Programs. These audits are a critical element for each of
9 these programs, as they require a report and/or a
10 certification to be submitted to the Board annually, upon
11 which compliance is determined. Some programs' reports
12 and/or certifications are under penalty of perjury.

13 Board staff is very limited in our ability to
14 verify the information received from the reporting
15 entities. Auditing the reports and the supporting
16 documentation is the best tool available for staff to
17 verify and validate the information received.

18 Currently there is funding only for the state
19 agency Buy-Recycled Campaign and the Rigid Plastic
20 Packaging Programs. In addition, the state agency
21 Buy-Recycled Campaign audits will focus on agencies with
22 large fleets, as these audits are funded by oil and tire
23 funds.

24 This is a three-year contract for \$179,000 and is
25 funded by three different funding sources: Seventy-nine

1 thousand dollars from the Integrated Waste Management
2 account by Fiscal Year '02-'03, BCP Number 2, for the
3 Rigid Plastic Packaging Program; \$50,000 from the Used Oil
4 Recycling Fund; and \$50,000 per year from the Five-Year
5 Tire Plan.

6 Staff recommends that the Committee adopts Option
7 1 and adopts Resolution 2003-307, approving the scope of
8 work, and 2003-308, which approves the Department of
9 Finance as the contractor for the audits.

10 This concludes my presentation. If you have any
11 questions, I'll be more than happy to answer them.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, just a couple
13 of questions. As you know, I'll be -- we'll send this to
14 the full Board for adoption. But there's a couple of
15 questions I wanted to raise with this.

16 In terms of the specific criteria for choosing
17 state agencies, what were those criteria in selecting the
18 agencies to be audited?

19 MS. MARSH: Oh, those would be the particular
20 agencies that have very large fleets -- vehicle fleets.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, give me a
22 few -- like DGS, I would take, CalTrans --

23 MS. MARSH: Yes, I have a list right here.

24 DGS, CalTrans, Corrections, Fish and Game --

25 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: -- Water Resources --

1 MS. MARSH: -- Water Resources.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: -- the Highway Patrol,
3 Parks and Rec.

4 As you'll notice, the funding for these audits
5 came from oil and tires. And that's why we have a focus
6 on fleets for this first round.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: So since DGS must
8 give approval for the performing of this audit, are they
9 being exempt, or how is that --

10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Basically -- right. They
11 give us the authority to do the audits. And so obviously
12 they don't want to give us authority to do an audit on
13 themselves.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: All right. Great.

15 All right. Well, thank you. We'll send this
16 particular item to the full Board for consideration.

17 MS. MARSH: Thank you.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: We'll wait till
19 they get Ms. Peace back.

20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Okay.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: All right.

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Okay. Agenda Item 7,
23 Committee Item H, consideration of contractor of the State
24 Green Lodging Contract.

25 And Barbara Van Gee will present.

1 MS. VAN GEE: Good afternoon, Committee members.

2 This item recommends for approval California
3 State University Sacramento, their College of Continuing
4 Education, as the contractor for the Green Lodging
5 Contract in the amount of \$30,000. We will be entering
6 into an interagency agreement with them.

7 The scope of work was approved at the February
8 11, 2003, Board meeting. The tasks include developing
9 criteria for defining Green Lodging, marketing the
10 program, and developing a travel guide for state employees
11 and state agencies.

12 Sacramento State is partnering with a principal
13 of Green Seal, who has extensive experience with other
14 Green Lodging programs. I've handed out a contractor
15 profile on California State University as well as Green
16 Seal.

17 And staff recommends the Committee approve Option
18 1 and adopt Resolution 2003-345 revised.

19 If you have any questions.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: No questions.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay. I would like to
22 move Resolution Number 2003-345 revised, consideration
23 contractor for the State Green Lodging Contract (Fiscal
24 Year 2002/2003 Contract Concept number 22).

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Second.

1 We'll substitute the previous roll call.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Okay. That one would also
3 be on fiscal consent.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Fiscal consent.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: And then our last item --
6 saved the best for last here -- consideration of the final
7 report for the Building Material Emissions Study.

8 And Dana Papke will present.

9 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
10 Presented as follows.)

11 MS. PAPKE: Good afternoon. I have a PowerPoint
12 presentation.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Hey, I thought I
14 had got by with this Committee on PowerPoint.

15 One out of 12 ain't bad.

16 MS. PAPKE: This is for consideration of the
17 final report for the Building Materials Emissions Testing
18 Study.

19 Before I get into my presentation I'd like to
20 acknowledge that we had a distinguished group of advisors
21 that provided assistance with this study.

22 --o0o--

23 MS. PAPKE: All the participants are not listed
24 here, but I'd like to acknowledge some of the key
25 advisors, namely, Leon Alevantis, who is actually in the

1 audience today. He is the principal investigator. And he
2 is here to provide technical assistance or answer any
3 specific questions, if needed.

4 Leon, do you want to stand.

5 Okay.

6 --o0o--

7 MS. PAPKE: Based on the fact that indoor air
8 quality is often more polluted than outdoor air and we
9 spend so much time indoors, it's become one of the top
10 five environmental risks to public health. In fact, good
11 indoor air quality has become one of the most important
12 features of a sustainable building.

13 --o0o--

14 MS. PAPKE: While the Integrated Waste Management
15 Board has been promoting recycled content products for use
16 in sustainable building, little was known regarding their
17 chemical emissions and effect on indoor air quality. This
18 unknown actually led to recycled content products being
19 subject to greater scrutiny than their standard
20 counterparts. So one of the main objectives of this study
21 was to examine the relationship of recycled content
22 products and their effect on indoor air quality.

23 Additionally, since most existing studies are
24 limited to measuring chemical emissions from standard
25 products, another purpose of the study was to compare the

1 emissions of standard and alternative products. And for
2 the purpose of this study, alternative products not only
3 include recycled content, but also include rapidly
4 renewable and/or products with low or no volatile organic
5 compounds, also known as VOCs.

6 Lastly, it was our intention to evaluate whether
7 standard and alternative products were low emitting and
8 met an indoor air quality criteria known as Section 1350
9 for use in classrooms and state construction.

10 --o0o--

11 MS. PAPKE: Why classrooms and state
12 construction? Mainly for the fact that there's going to
13 be about 400 new schools, totaling \$50 billion over the
14 next four years and the fact that the state invests \$2
15 billion annually to operate nearly 200 million square feet
16 of office space and an additional 21 million square feet
17 of leased space.

18 --o0o--

19 MS. PAPKE: The first two phases of the study
20 were selected based on those plan construction.

21 The Phase 3 was added based on the fact that 33
22 million waste tires are generated each year, and the Board
23 is promoting these recycled content products. And we
24 wanted to test the claims to find out whether or not these
25 recycled content products were low emitting for indoor

1 applications.

2 --o0o--

3 MS. PAPKE: Here are the 11 material categories
4 we tested. The specific products were selected within
5 these material categories based on their typical use in
6 state construction and schools. And also the alternative
7 products were selected based on those that are promoted
8 through the collaborative for high performance schools as
9 well as those on our recycled content products database.

10 --o0o--

11 MS. PAPKE: The methodology for the study is
12 called Section 1350. It's a special environmental
13 requirement specification. And it's been developed to
14 screen building materials. It was developed by the
15 California Department of Health Services, the Air
16 Resources Board, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard
17 Assessment, as well as other indoor air quality experts,
18 with significant support from the Board.

19 It was originally developed for the State of
20 California modular office furniture specifications, which
21 is a \$60 million statewide contract. It was then modified
22 for use at the East End Project, which is a \$392 million
23 state construction project. Section 1350 has since been
24 incorporated into the Department of General Services
25 standard agreement for architectural services. It's also

1 been included as part of the collaborative for High
2 Performance Schools Best Practices Manual and it's been
3 adopted by the scientific certification systems for their
4 environmentally preferable product criteria.

5 --o0o--

6 MS. PAPKE: While Section 1350 was the
7 methodology for the report, the report also includes some
8 additional indoor air quality considerations which are not
9 necessarily part of the Section 1350 screening criteria.
10 However, this information provides additional data for
11 architects and designers when selecting building
12 materials.

13 --o0o--

14 MS. PAPKE: The sampling was conducted at the
15 Department of Health Services Environmental Health
16 Laboratory in Berkeley. Products were tested in assembly
17 according to the manufacturer's recommended protocols or,
18 for example, if a product was recommended using a specific
19 adhesive, that adhesive was used in the assembly of the
20 product. And they were aired out for ten days for
21 conditioning in a controlled environment. And the
22 compliance is based on the 96 hour test results which are
23 representative of real time installation.

24 --o0o--

25 MS. PAPKE: In order to determine whether or not

1 a product actually meets the Section 1350 criteria, the
2 modeled air concentration was modeled -- or calculated for
3 each specific design, mainly for the classrooms in the
4 state office. And this formula takes into consideration
5 an emission factor and the material -- or the surface area
6 the material covers as well as the room volume and
7 ventilation rates.

8 --o0o--

9 MS. PAPKE: Before I review the specific test
10 results I'd like to acknowledge some of the limitations of
11 the study. Since this laboratory testing is within a
12 small chamber, real world performance may be different.
13 Another limitation to the study deals with the sample
14 size. While the 77 products that we tested represent a
15 comprehensive list of the commonly used standard products
16 and quite a few alternative counterparts, budgetary
17 restrictions limited the total number of products we could
18 test. And it would have been ideal to test many samples
19 per product line.

20 Another limitation has to do with the varying age
21 of samples. Also there is a limitation with the
22 potentially changing manufacturing process. And the
23 products that we tested may or may not be available in the
24 future.

25 Another limitation has to do with the fact that

1 we only looked at two specific environmental attributes.
2 We looked at alternative and standard products and their
3 effect on indoor air quality. It would have been ideal to
4 look at additional environmentally preferable criteria
5 such as embodied energy or the pollution associated with
6 the manufacturing process, but we couldn't look at those
7 attributes.

8 --o0o--

9 MS. PAPKE: Here's the results overall. For the
10 classroom calculations most products met Section 1350, and
11 about 16 exceeded the guideline.

12 --o0o--

13 MS. PAPKE: For the state office calculation
14 there were fewer products that actually met the 1350
15 concentration limits. I do have the specific information.
16 But for the sake of brevity, we decided to leave reporting
17 the results of the individual material categories to your
18 discretion. So please let me know if you'd like to see
19 those individual results. I have them at the end of this
20 presentation.

21 --o0o--

22 MS. PAPKE: Overall, the key conclusions -- there
23 are quite a few in the actual report, but these are the
24 key conclusions -- are that most products passed the 1350
25 criteria. And the recycled content products performed

1 about the same as the standard products. Therefore, we
2 believe that recycled content products should no longer be
3 held to the higher standard.

4 And the tire-derived products may need further
5 refinement and testing before they can be promoted for
6 wide use indoors. And this is mainly based on the fact
7 that the tire-derived products had total volatile organic
8 compounds, or TVOCs, that exceeded the additional indoor
9 air quality threshold. But when modeled for larger spaces
10 such as the gymnasiums and the multipurpose rooms, those
11 TVOCs were below the criteria. So they may be more
12 appropriate for larger spaces.

13 Lastly, the carpeting. Some of the results in
14 the study are inconsistent with those reported by the
15 product certification programs such as the Carpet and Rug
16 Institute's Green Label Program. Based on the results of
17 the study, manufacturers are encouraged to conduct product
18 testing according to Section 1350 through independent
19 laboratories.

20 --o0o--

21 MS. PAPKE: As you may be aware, we did hold a
22 meeting with the manufacturers, on June 5th. One of the
23 comments that we received since then is that the industry
24 has not had enough time to review and comment on the
25 report. And you may have been overwhelmed as well when

1 you saw the length of this report. But in actuality it's
2 only about 40 pages of text and 360 pages of data. So I
3 just wanted to make that clear.

4 Another concern had to do with the fact that
5 there are no certified laboratories, and there may be some
6 varying results in the future. Secondly, the
7 manufacturers were concerned that this study did not
8 follow specific procedures for handling every single
9 material. Thirdly, there was a concern about the varying
10 age of samples. And, lastly, manufacturers wanted to
11 ensure that we weren't certifying their products based on
12 these test results.

13 --o0o--

14 MS. PAPKE: As I mentioned earlier, just because
15 a product meets Section 1350 for a specific design such as
16 a classroom does not necessarily mean that it will meet
17 the criteria for use in the state office. And you saw in
18 those overall summary tables that actually fewer products
19 met Section 1350 for use in a typical state office because
20 that's a smaller environment, and the chemical emissions
21 may be larger in those smaller areas.

22 The report stresses the need for manufacturers to
23 test their own products according to Section 1350 to prove
24 that they're low emitting for a specific application. For
25 those manufacturers with products that met Section -- or

1 exceeded Section 1350, staff is willing to work with them
2 to identify ways their products could be reformulated so
3 that they are lower emitting. For those manufacturers
4 with products that met Section 1350, we suggested that
5 they make this information readily available.

6 The report also encourages manufacturers to
7 contact the Division of the State Architect so that their
8 products can be considered for inclusion in the
9 environmentally preferable products database that they're
10 developing.

11 --o0o--

12 MS. PAPKE: Here are the five board options as
13 you've reviewed in the agenda item.

14 --o0o--

15 MS. PAPKE: Staff recommends adoption of Option
16 Number 2, with specific changes. We've been informed by
17 our contractor that they're developing an errata sheet
18 because there are some specific changes that will need to
19 take place in the report. There were also some
20 calculation errors that will modify the test results by
21 about 20 percent of all the products. But that really
22 only affects two specific products for their use in a
23 state office. So it only means that one of the standard
24 carpets that passed no longer meets the Section 1350
25 criteria for a state office. And the same with an

1 alternative MDF. So it really only affects two products.
2 But the other specific changes have to do with the
3 formatting by Public Affairs, and the Department of Health
4 Services had some formatting specifications that they
5 approved that we'd like to include.

6 This Option Number 2 with the specific changes
7 should dispel the myths and prove that there are low
8 emitting recycled content products that can contribute to
9 healthy indoor environments.

10 Thank you.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Thank you, Dana,
12 for that presentation.

13 I am prepared -- no. The document is 40 pages --
14 the text is 40 pages. But there's a lot of stuff in
15 there.

16 MS. PAPKE: There's a lot of data.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: And so what I'm
18 prepared to do is I would like to move this to the full
19 Board. I don't think that the Committee should move this
20 out of committee. And then I've just recently received
21 some more information --

22 MS. PAPKE: I tried to address those in my
23 presentation, but --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: You did a good job
25 too.

1 MS. PAPKE: Thanks.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: And we really do
3 appreciate it.

4 So we're going to move this one to the full Board
5 for consideration.

6 MS. PAPKE: Okay. Thank you.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Thank you.

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR WOHL: Okay. That concludes the
9 Waste Prevention and Market Development.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Thank you very
11 much.

12 Diversion, Planning and Local Development
13 Committee will come forward.

14 Good afternoon.

15 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Committee members. My name is
16 Lorraine Van Kekerix, and I'm substituting for Pat Schiavo
17 today.

18 I have the first item as the Deputy Director's
19 report, will be very brief.

20 With the Board's consideration of the biennial
21 review agenda items included in this agenda package, the
22 Board will have considered all of the 1999 and 2000
23 biennial reviews. So this wraps up the cycle.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Well, I know you
25 guys are glad, huh?

1 MS. MORGAN: We're really glad.

2 MS. VAN KEKERIX: We have in terms of state
3 agencies, 387 of the annual reports due from SAVE Agencies
4 have been submitted. We have 19 agencies that are
5 finalizing information for final submittal, and 7 agencies
6 have yet to respond to the Board with an annual report.

7 The state agency staff is working with several of
8 the agencies to get their submittals, and they continue to
9 work towards 100 percent compliance.

10 We have a lot of staff who are working closely
11 with our customers in the field, working with
12 jurisdictions, out working with state agencies, and also
13 out on the unannounced site visits for the disposal
14 reporting system survey week.

15 And the last item in the Deputy Director's report
16 is our disposal reporting system regulations, the second
17 informal draft, are expected to be released within the
18 next week. And we have workshops which we have noticed on
19 June 24th in Diamond Bar and on June 26th here in
20 Sacramento to discuss the regulations with interested
21 parties.

22 And that concludes my Deputy Director report.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Great. Thank you.

24 Any questions or comments on the report?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: No.

1 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Our first item, Item L, is
2 consideration of the application for an SB 1066 time
3 extension by the City of Redondo Beach, Los Angeles
4 County.

5 And Steve Uselton will give the presentation.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: All right, great.

7 Just before Steve starts I want to note that Item
8 K, Agenda Item 11, has been deleted from the agenda.

9 All right, Steve.

10 MR. USELTON: Good afternoon, Committee members.

11 This city of Redondo Beach has requested an
12 extension through December 31st of 2004. The specific
13 reasons the city needs a time extension are as follows:

14 One, to modify the construction and demolition
15 program in order to fill gaps in reporting, and to conduct
16 additional outreach and education that will help the city
17 improve participation and capture diversion information
18 from construction and demolition projects that are
19 occurring within the city.

20 Also the city would like to expand residential
21 curbside recycling. Its current program is consisting of
22 a semi-automated collection program of green waste and
23 recyclables. Currently that program is only offered to
24 250 residences in a 64 gallon container. All other
25 residences are using an 18 gallon container. Through this

1 time extension the city will plan to expand that so that
2 all residents receive the larger 64 gallon capacity
3 containers.

4 The city would also like to provide additional
5 outreach and education to businesses to promote commercial
6 recycling. The city has approved a new exclusive
7 commercial hauling agreement that increases commercial
8 outreach, diversion programs, and includes economic
9 incentives for commercial participation.

10 The city anticipates a 25 to 33 percent increase
11 in its diversion rate as a result of these programs.

12 Board staff would also like to inform the Board
13 that on June 3rd of 2003 the city of Redondo Beach City
14 Council did award a solid waste handling agreement that
15 will take effect on November 1st, 2003. The city has
16 indicated to Board staff that major programs proposed in
17 this time extension will be implemented under the new
18 agreement. And staff has reviewed agreement, and it
19 appears to provide for the programs described in this plan
20 of correction.

21 Board staff has determined that the information
22 submitted in the application is adequately documented and
23 is recommending the Board approve the time extension
24 request by the city.

25 That concludes my presentation. There is not a

1 city representative present.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: I just have one
3 question, Steve. What caused the city diversion rate to
4 drop from 37 in '98 to 28 in 2000?

5 MR. USELTON: Well, we've looked at that issue
6 with the city. Concurrent to that time period there was a
7 change in the service provider within the city. The city
8 has attempted to work with the service provider to find
9 out whether or not there was actually more disposal that
10 was occurring with the new service or whether there were
11 reporting issues, problems with the disposal reporting
12 system.

13 Much of that work was uncovered during a
14 base-year review study that staff brought to the Board in
15 March. We feel that that is the most accurate information
16 that describes what the city's diversion rate is.

17 We weren't able to actually uncover what was
18 driving that. It could have been the allocation that --
19 the allocation differences between the two haulers. Also
20 during that time period there was some redevelopment --
21 extensive redevelopment activities that were occurring
22 within the city. And that might have also been driving up
23 the disposal values.

24 We do feel that the programs that are outlined in
25 the city's plan of correction will address those issues

1 and will bring the rate up.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, because Ms.
3 Peace and I was sitting here looking. In 1999 it was down
4 to 19. That was really --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: That's really pitiful.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: -- kind of tight
7 there, yeah.

8 Ms. Peace.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: So why is it just now in
10 2003 that they're thinking they better implement some
11 programs? Why has it taken them so long?

12 MR. USELTON: Well, I wish the city were here to
13 respond to that directly. I can tell you through the
14 staff analysis, both the base year and the time extension,
15 that this case really drives home the idea that it's not
16 just sufficient to implement programs, but there has to be
17 continuous monitoring to determine the effectiveness of
18 those programs.

19 The city has historically had a residential
20 recycling program. It's an 18 gallon crate system.
21 Through the base-year study they were able to see how
22 those values were affecting the overall diversion rate,
23 and it was obvious that there was a need to expand that
24 program.

25 That would also apply to the commercial sector,

1 where free bin service has always been provided to the
2 commercial businesses. But the participation levels may
3 not have been as high as they needed to be. And, again,
4 that information was readily -- could readily be seen when
5 the base-year study was completed and we were able to look
6 at the full picture.

7 That's --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: You mean so the city had
9 no idea that they were this low until you did your
10 base-year --

11 MR. USELTON: Again, they were working off of
12 some of the information, as you mentioned, where they were
13 up as high as 34 percent and then took a significant drop.

14 I think, you know, in seeing that drop occur,
15 there was some reaction that took place and the need to,
16 you know, do a new base-year study, get an accurate
17 picture and address any gaps or deficiencies that were
18 brought to light through that study.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: It says here that with
20 all these programs that they're going to have an
21 additional 25 to 33 percent increase in their diversion
22 rate. That still won't even bring them close to 50
23 percent, if their diversion rate's only what, 28 percent
24 and they're going to do 33 percent better than that?

25 MR. USELTON: Yeah, that's better than that.

1 It's going to increase their rate by 25 to 33 percent,
2 not -- that won't be the --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: It won't be just 25 more
4 than this 28? You mean it's an additional --

5 MR. USELTON: Yes, additional overall improvement
6 in the rate.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: All right. I hope
9 that they really do --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: How does this compare to
11 other cities that have been put on a 1066? Are you
12 getting as much cooperation from them? It just doesn't
13 seem like they should have this much trouble, you know,
14 being clear down at 28 percent. It's not like they're a
15 real poor area. It's not like they're a rural area. I
16 mean what is the -- why are they having so much trouble
17 compared to other cities?

18 MR. USELTON: In looking forward with the time
19 extension, the new agreement will provide for some
20 improvement in services that were needed. Again, we did
21 have a level of services that was being provided. And,
22 you know, as we got a clearer picture on the diversion
23 rate that was identified through the new base-year study,
24 it was obvious that those programs were not enough to
25 fully meet the diversion requirements. The city has

1 responded to that with an RFP that actually had to be
2 initiated, as far -- I'm not certain when they initiated
3 that RFP process. But typically it is an extended,
4 protracted process that cities go through.

5 So their acknowledgement of problems with their
6 programs was identified. And we hope that the steps that
7 they're taking are going to improve their ability to meet
8 these requirements.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: And they seem to be
10 serious about this? Are they taking this seriously?
11 Because I see there's no one even here today.

12 MR. USELTON: They cited budget reasons as the
13 reason for not being able to attend. The RFP is a
14 significant step.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: And what happens if they
16 don't get to 50 percent at the end of their extension?

17 MR. USELTON: Well, we would need to bring that
18 back to the Board with an analysis of what they did do,
19 where things -- promises, whether they were kept or were
20 not kept. And we would need to seek the Board's direction
21 on what steps should occur next in terms of further -- you
22 know, in enforcement action, et cetera.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Well, I certainly
24 hope that --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: And also in here it says

1 that Board staff believes the programs outlined in the
2 plan of correction will address the barriers the city has
3 faced.

4 And, again, what barriers has this city faced
5 that other cities that have gotten their diversion higher
6 than this, you know, haven't faced?

7 MR. USELTON: One of the barriers that was cited
8 by the city in their plan of -- or in their time extension
9 request was a significant increase in the amount of
10 redevelopment projects that were occurring within the
11 city. That could have had an increase on their overall
12 disposal related to C&D materials that would end up at the
13 landfill. That material is heavy and can drive disposal
14 rates rather quickly to become higher.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I take it then some of
16 their programs will be dealing with C&D related --

17 MR. USELTON: One of the programs identified in
18 the time extension is to focus on -- they did have --
19 again, they had an existing C&D ordinance. What they were
20 finding is, that not all projects were complying with the
21 reporting that was to occur. And there were -- it
22 probably was not -- it was not defined enough in terms of
23 what information needed to come back to the city on where
24 the materials were diverted to.

25 They are fixing that, and that is part of this

1 plan of correction.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Well, I would
3 certainly hope that they would really work on this plan of
4 correction. And I'm sure that you will, Steve, go back
5 and convey to them the Board's concern about the lower
6 number that they had and that they could certainly get
7 that number up to a higher level.

8 MR. USELTON: I will certainly do that.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah. You know,
10 would like to move this item to the full Board for
11 consideration. And if you would have the city folks here
12 at our full Board meeting so they can answer some of these
13 questions, we'd certainly appreciate it.

14 MR. USELTON: I will do that.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: All right. Thank
16 you.

17 Next, ma'am.

18 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Our next item is Item M,
19 consideration of staff recommendation on the 1999-2000
20 biennial review findings for the Source Reduction and
21 Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element
22 for the following jurisdictions: Nevada County: Grass
23 City and Nevada City.

24 And Steve Sorelle will present.

25 MR. SORELLE: Good afternoon, Committee members.

1 Yeah, a slight correction. That's Grass Valley and Nevada
2 City.

3 Item M presents to the Committee for its
4 consideration board staff's findings for the '99-2000
5 biennial review period. Staff conducted their biennial
6 reviews and found that these jurisdictions have achieved a
7 2000 diversion rate of at least 50 percent and are
8 adequately implementing source reduction, recycling,
9 composting, public education and information programs as
10 outlined in their Source Reduction and Recycling Element
11 and Household Hazardous Waste Element.

12 This item lists those jurisdictions for which
13 staff is recommending approval of the '99-2000 biennial
14 review. However, should the Board not accept the staff's
15 recommendation, one jurisdiction did reserve the right to
16 request an SB 1066 time extension, while the other
17 jurisdiction did not elect to reserve the right in their
18 2000 annual report so submit an SB 1066 extension request,
19 which gives the Board an alternative set of options as
20 outlined in the agenda item.

21 This concludes my presentation. Board staff and
22 representatives for the jurisdictions are available should
23 you have any questions.

24 Thank you.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: All right. Thank

1 you.

2 Any questions, Ms. Peace?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: No, I don't have any
4 problems with this one.

5 With that I'd like to move Resolution Number
6 2003-313, consideration of the staff recommendation on the
7 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the Source
8 Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous
9 Waste Element for the following jurisdictions: Nevada
10 County: Grass Valley and Nevada City.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Second.

12 And with that we'll substitute the previous roll
13 call.

14 All right.

15 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Our next item is Item N,
16 consideration of Board staff's alternative daily cover
17 investigation starting in summer 2002 as it relates to
18 claiming diversion for use of alternative daily cover at
19 Kirby Canyon Landfill, Hay Road/B&J Landfill, Tri Cities
20 Landfill, Altamont Landfill, Vasco Road Landfill, Pacheco
21 Pass Landfill, Forward, Inc., Landfill, and Newby Island
22 landfill.

23 And Boons Baythavong will make the presentation
24 for staff.

25 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was

1 Presented as follows.)

2 MR. BAYTHAVONG: Good afternoon, Board members.
3 Boons Baythavong with the Waste Analysis Branch.

4 This is a consideration item of Board staff's
5 2002 ADC investigation as it relates to claiming diversion
6 for ADC use at landfills located in northern California.

7 Landfills consist of Kirby Canyon, Hay Road, Tri
8 Cities, Altamont, Vasco Road, Pacheco Pass, Forward, Inc.,
9 and Newby Island Landfill.

10 --o0o--

11 MR. BAYTHAVONG: I'm going to start off by
12 providing some background information before going into
13 the 2001 investigation summary.

14 Public Resources Code 41781.3 established ADC and
15 other waste materials beneficially used at landfills
16 constitute diversion through recycling. Regulations
17 specify ADC materials applied in excess of requirements
18 for cover constitute disposal, not diversion.

19 Title 14 California Code of Regulations Section
20 18810 requires facility operators to report total tons of
21 each type of ADC or alternative intermediate cover used
22 from each jurisdiction.

23 --o0o--

24 MR. BAYTHAVONG: Board staff conducted its first
25 ADC investigation in 2001. This was due to Board staff's

1 recognition of the significant amounts of ADC reported to
2 the disposal reporting system by some facilities. Nine
3 facilities were investigated for ADC usage.

4 In late 2001, the Board determined that there was
5 misreporting of ADC at seven facilities.

6 At the 2002 April Board meeting the Board
7 determined ADC overuse at Fontana and Colton Refuse
8 Disposal site. The Board directed staff to allocate
9 excess ADC as disposal. And at that same meeting, the
10 Board instructed staff to focus future efforts on
11 additional facilities to provide a more complete
12 examination of ADC usage in California.

13 --o0o--

14 MR. BAYTHAVONG: Board staff through the
15 Permitting and Enforcement and DPLA conducted an ADC
16 investigation at eight landfills in late July 2002. And
17 they include Kirby Canyon, Hay Road, Tri Cities, Altamont,
18 Vasco Road, Pacheco pass, Forward, Inc., and Newby Island
19 Landfill.

20 The facilities were selected based on concerns
21 raised by stakeholders at ADC workshops about a facility's
22 use of ADC or relatively high quarterly ADC usage. At
23 each facility Board staff requested records on disposal,
24 ADC, AIC, and beneficial use materials.

25 The June 2003 P&E agenda item contains a detailed

1 discussion of whether facilities met state minimum
2 standards for ADC usage.

3 --o0o--

4 MR. BAYTHAVONG: Board staff received records
5 from all facilities. In order to determine the accuracy
6 of data in DRS, Board staff needed to compare the landfill
7 and DRS records to provide some background. The DRS
8 records reflect disposal in ADC data submitted by
9 counties. The counties received that data from all of the
10 disposal facilities located within their county
11 boundaries.

12 Therefore, the landfill records submitted to
13 Board staff should match the DRS records.

14 The disposal tonnages submitted by the landfills
15 compared closely with the disposal tonnages in DRS. The
16 difference was equal to less than 2 percent. However,
17 there were discrepancies between ADC tonnages. Six
18 facilities' records did not match DRS. The Staff worked
19 with landfills for several months to resolve the
20 discrepancies.

21 --o0o--

22 MR. BAYTHAVONG: The 4th column shows percent
23 difference between landfill and DRS records. The primary
24 reasons for differences between the records include: DRS
25 reported ADC which included other beneficial use tons;

1 confusion on ADC coding in the data tracking system;
2 remission of ADC tons from a transfer station.

3 And specific to Vasco Road Landfill, all green
4 waste material used as ADC, those recycled off-site or
5 used beneficially on-site, was lumped together. The
6 facility had no documentation to show what portion was
7 used specifically for ADC on-site, so the correct ADC
8 amount could not be confirmed.

9 DRS staff recommend that the ADC reports be
10 corrected for 2001.

11 --o0o--

12 MR. BAYTHAVONG: As set forth in Title 27
13 California Code of regulations Section 2690, waste-derived
14 materials used as ADC shall be restricted to quantities no
15 more than necessary to meet the performance requirements.
16 ADC material applied in excess of requirements for cover
17 counts as disposal, not diversion. And after the initial
18 2002 ADC investigation, P&E Board staff conducted state
19 inspections at eight facilities in conjunction with the
20 LEAs. State inspections did not discover any ADC overuse.
21 And based on P&E staff's findings, DRS staff recommend
22 that the corrected ADC tonnages count as diversion.

23 --o0o--

24 MR. BAYTHAVONG: Key issues. There were
25 discrepancies between landfill and DRS records on ADC

1 tonnages. The Board and county staff do not have other
2 data in which to cross-check the ADC data with. Board
3 staff can only rely on an examination of ADC trends over
4 time to highlight any anomalies.

5 The Board staff believe that the proposed
6 revisions to both ADC and DRS regulations will provide
7 staff, LEAs, and operators more complete basis for
8 determining compliance status in the future.

9 Board staff recommend continued work with LEAs to
10 conduct any necessary ADC investigations as findings of
11 high quarterly ADC usage by facilities are discovered
12 through DRS.

13 --o0o--

14 MR. BAYTHAVONG: Options for the Board include:

15 1) Determine that there is no ADC overuse at all
16 eight landfills;

17 2) Direct Board staff to revise DRS using the
18 confirmed ADC tonnages;

19 3) Direct Board staff to address ADC issues in
20 DRS regulations related to increasing documentation,
21 access to records, accuracy of records, and audit
22 frequency;

23 4) Direct Board staff to continue to monitor ADC
24 use at landfills; and

25 5) Direct Board staff to undertake different or

1 additional tasks and report back to the Board with
2 complete findings and recommendations.

3 --o0o--

4 MR. BAYTHAVONG: Board staff recommends:

5 1) Determine there was ADC overuse at all eight
6 landfills;

7 2) Direct board staff to revise DRS using the
8 confirmed ADC tonnages;

9 3) Direct Board staff to address ADC issues in
10 DRS regulations related to increasing documentation,
11 access to records, accuracy of records, and audit
12 frequency; and

13 4) Direct Board staff to continue to monitor ADC
14 use at landfills.

15 This concludes my presentation. Are there any
16 questions?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, I have a
18 question for you. In terms of -- I'll just take Newby
19 Island. Just so I'm clear on what's going on here, the
20 alternative daily covering, what, you went in and you did
21 an investigation to see if they were overusing or
22 underusing? Which one?

23 MR. BAYTHAVONG: Overusing.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Overusing. And you
25 found out that they weren't overusing?

1 MR. BAYTHAVONG: No, it was a reporting issue.
2 What happens is -- was that the County of Santa Clara --
3 their form doesn't allow the facility to report ADC
4 separate from beneficial use. So what they had to do was
5 lump in the total amount.

6 MS. VAN KEKERIX: The ADC is used as the cover,
7 whereas the beneficial use could be roads within the
8 landfill, the wet weather paths, those kinds of things.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Right.

10 Okay. Ms. Peace.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Yeah, back to Newby
12 Island here.

13 If you just take a percentage of the ADC as a
14 percentage of the total disposal tonnage, there's such
15 differences. Newby Island's like 29 percent. And why are
16 they so much higher than all the other landfills? What do
17 they do there that they need so much more ADC or
18 beneficial use than other landfills do, as compared to the
19 total tonnage that they take in? They're calling 29
20 percent of what they take in ADC.

21 MR. BAYTHAVONG: Well, it's already --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: So some of the other
23 ones are only at like 4 percent.

24 MR. BAYTHAVONG: If you look at that, comparing
25 it to all the other landfills, it's actually -- because

1 there's so many factors related, such as face size and
2 material types.

3 And we also have Permitting and Enforcement staff
4 here that'll be able to answer that question in further
5 detail.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, I understand
7 you guys did an inspection, huh.

8 MS. MADISON-JOHNSON: Yes, hi. I'm Mary
9 Madison-Johnson with Permitting and Inspection branch.

10 We did do inspections at all the eight landfills.
11 And as we talked about yesterday at the Permitting and
12 Enforcement Committee, we found no overuse at any
13 landfills. And as a matter of fact, in some cases we
14 found underuse.

15 But as far as the Newby situation goes, I think
16 what was going on, if I can speak for Boons, is they were
17 reporting ADC material, but they were actually using it as
18 beneficial use. So all their road base and waste-derived
19 material -- because, you know, concrete that they had
20 crushed to use as road base, they reported that as ADC.
21 And I think that's the difference in the reporting that
22 needs to be figured out to make sure we're only counting
23 that that's actually waste-derived cover material versus
24 beneficial use.

25 Does that respond to your question?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Yeah.

2 Do you have any sort -- so what you're saying,
3 every landfill is just so different, you couldn't say,
4 well, because they take this amount of tonnage, they
5 should be using approximately within this range amount of
6 ADC?

7 MS. MADISON-JOHNSON: Yeah, there are cover
8 ratios based on the amount of soil and the amount of
9 material that it would take to cover up the tonnage that
10 they take each day. There are ratios of how to equate
11 that. But I think in Newby's case, it's -- you know, they
12 are a large landfill, so they have a higher tonnage. But
13 they also reported a lot of material as beneficial use
14 instead of ADC.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: So these other ones
16 where it's lower percentage, they have it broken out where
17 they have ADC here and beneficial use here?

18 MS. MADISON-JOHNSON: Yeah, some of them did have
19 it broken out. Whereas Newby lumped it all together.

20 MS. VAN KEKERIX: There's also the issue of ADC
21 uses allowed. But they may not use ADC every day for the
22 entire working face that they're covering. So we get
23 quite a range simply because they may use only what ADC
24 they have available. And if they have a working face
25 that's very small, then they won't need to apply as much

1 or they may decide that they need that day to cover that
2 face with soil or they may have soil available and they
3 don't use the ADC. So that part of the variability
4 depends on what's happening at the landfill at that
5 particular time.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: How much usage is
7 involved?

8 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Right.

9 So there is a great deal of variability in the
10 amounts.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Okay. I see
12 another one here, Vasco Road. Now, you guys have -- the
13 staff confirmed it's undetermined. Why is that?

14 MR. BAYTHAVONG: Well, I spoke with the landfill
15 operator. And what happened was the green waste that came
16 in, they didn't document what portion was used as ADC
17 on-site and what portion was used off-site as recycled.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Okay. We have one
19 person who wants to testify.

20 Chuck Helget.

21 MR. HELGET: Mr. Chairman, Board Member Peace.
22 Chuck Helget representing Allied Waste Industries.

23 I didn't come down here to testify today. But
24 all of a sudden Newby Island comes up again. And I
25 thought I would be useful -- and not to burn up Committee

1 time -- to provide a little background on Newby Island,
2 because I think it's in some ways unfortunately a poster
3 child for, quote "ADC abuse," and in other ways it should
4 be a poster child for the appropriate use of ADC.

5 You have a very competitive situation in the Bay
6 Area for ADC materials. You have several landfills in
7 that area that are extraordinarily competitive. Two years
8 ago, three years ago, four years ago, and year before
9 last, there were allegations brought to this Board about
10 ADC abuse at Newby Island. And I would like, finally, to
11 be able to point to a slide that says there is no ADC
12 abuse at Newby Island; and your staff basically has
13 confirmed that. We've done that in the past. The records
14 you looked at today, Board Member Peace, indicate that
15 Newby Island is something around 24 percent on ADC. The
16 corrected -- I'm sorry.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Twenty-nine is compared
18 to --

19 MR. HELGET: The corrected records from that I
20 believe indicate that it's about 14 to 12 percent. That's
21 typically where the records have been for ADC at Newby
22 Island in our use.

23 They've -- I'll pull the records and go through
24 that.

25 But tonnages -- when you use ADC and compare on

1 tonnages and you have a facility that uses C&D materials,
2 for example, which are significantly heavier than green
3 waste, you're going to get a higher percentage. And
4 that's one of the problems that we've always encountered
5 with trying to over-regulate ADC, is the lack of
6 recognition that each facility has different needs. They
7 have different sizes to their working face. They have
8 different materials that they use.

9 So setting a restriction, for example, of nobody
10 can use more than 12 percent for ADC doesn't make a whole
11 lot of sense because you may be over-restricting a lot of
12 facilities that need to have that kind of cover.

13 The last thing I'd like to point out is that
14 unfortunately yesterday at the P&E Committee meeting you
15 saw a permit in front of you for -- or an agenda item
16 discussing enforcement issues for ADC use. And Newby
17 Island was one of the facilities that was cited for
18 underuse of ADC. There's some irony there because its a
19 facility that is so -- has been so hypersensitive to the
20 use of ADC over the years because of a competitive
21 situation, that they're very, very cautious about what
22 they're using.

23 Now, they've also added -- and San Jose is where
24 the facility is located. There's a big tax on this stuff
25 now in San Jose. And so as far as an ADC issue at Newby

1 Island, particularly as it relates to C&D materials, there
2 isn't an issue anymore. We're not doing it because it's
3 not cost effective.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay. So this is one of
5 your landfills?

6 MR. HELGET: I'm sorry?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Newby Island is one of
8 your landfills?

9 MR. HELGET: Yes, it's one of Allied Waste's
10 landfills in the Bay Area.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: I just realized the
12 Forward, Inc., which is one of yours, they're only using 4
13 percent as compared to their total tonnage. So I was
14 asking why there is such a difference.

15 MR. HELGET: It's a very valid question. And
16 it's also I think indicative of why it's extraordinarily
17 difficult -- and we've gone through this with staff over
18 these years -- why -- using the disposal reporting system
19 to peg ADC abuse is probably not the right place to look
20 because the disposal reporting system does not give you
21 accurate information. One of the reasons why Newby Island
22 reports the way they do is because that's how we were
23 required by the county to report. It wasn't something we
24 made up. We get a report -- a form from the county
25 saying, "Categorize these materials that you used." We

1 fill in the numbers, send it to the county, it works its
2 way here. And all of a sudden we've got 29 percent ADC,
3 when those materials are all mixed and jumbled is the way
4 they get reported.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: So there was the
6 categories for the beneficial uses versus the ADC --

7 MR. HELGET: Yeah, beneficial use. One of the
8 things that happens at Newby is we get a lot of sludge --
9 periodically we take sludge from the City of San Jose.
10 It's dried sludge. We get that stuff, comes in the door,
11 and we get it about two or three times a year. That's
12 fairly heavy materials. We have now -- we use that
13 primarily for revegetation.

14 Newby Island is a facility -- and I would invite
15 all of you to come and visit the facility. I think it
16 would be very instructional in how ADC changes can be
17 made. But we've on the bay. And we're right on a
18 freeway. And so we do a lot of work to do -- to ensure
19 that the facility and tire facility is green. It makes a
20 big difference to people driving by on the freeway,
21 believe me. So we use a lot of the green -- we have a
22 composting facility, a recyclery there. We're one of the
23 few people that recycle mattresses. We have a grinding
24 operation now. There's's lots of improvements that have
25 been made to that facility in the last couple years. And

1 we'd be more than happy to take all of you through that.

2 But I just wanted to add that perspective. This
3 has been an issue that's been bouncing around for years,
4 and to try to put it in perspective. There's a
5 competitive issue here that I won't waste your time with
6 in front of the Committee. But I'd be more than happy to
7 talk to you all about it individually if you have any
8 concerns.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay. Thank you, Chuck.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Thank you.

11 Any other questions or comments?

12 All right.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay. I would like to
14 move Resolution Number 2003-309, consideration of the
15 Board staff's alternative daily cover investigation
16 starting in the summer of 2002 as it relates to claiming
17 diversion for use of alternative daily cover at Kirby
18 Canyon Landfill, Hay Road/B&J Landfill, Tri Cities
19 Landfill, Altamont Landfill, Vasco Road Landfill, Pacheco
20 Pass Landfill, Forward, Inc., Landfill, and Newby island
21 Landfill.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: And that would
23 include the recommendations of 1, 2, 3 and 4, staff
24 recommendations?

25 All right. I have a second.

1 And we'll substitute the previous roll call.

2 MS. VAN KEKERIX: I have a question.

3 Is that one to be presented to the full Board or
4 on consent?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yes, yes. Yeah, I
6 think we should present that to the full Board.

7 MS. VAN KEKERIX: And on our previous agenda
8 item -- I didn't catch it -- do you want the streamlined
9 biennial review to go on consent for the Board or to be a
10 presentation?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, we'll put
12 that -- yeah, that can go on consent.

13 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Okay. Thank you. So that's
14 Item M on consent?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Right.

16 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Our final item is Item O,
17 consideration of a contract concept, a scope of work, and
18 the Department of Food and Agriculture as contractor for
19 the food waste diversion at California Fairs Contract
20 (2002/2003 Integrated Waste Management Account Fund).

21 And Trevor O'Shaughnessy will do the presentation
22 for this.

23 MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Good afternoon, Committee
24 members. My Name is Trevor O'Shaughnessy of the State
25 Organization Facility Assistance Section.

1 Item O, Board Agenda Item 14, requests a set of
2 actions that will approve a contract concept for waste
3 diversion research and demonstration project at state-run
4 fairs, encumbering the funds, and selecting the Department
5 of Food and Agriculture, Division of Fairs and
6 Expositions, as the contractor under an interagency
7 agreement.

8 Staff recommends approval of the contract
9 concept, encumbrance of the funds, and selection of the
10 Department of Food and Agriculture, Division of Fairs and
11 Expositions, as the contractor.

12 Staff would like to note that there needs to be a
13 revised resolution for Resolution 2003-349. In second
14 "whereas" an error was caught that it's not noting the
15 resolution. And then at 3 X's it should be 2003-310, to
16 make that correction. And that will be done before the
17 Board meeting.

18 This concludes staff presentation. We're
19 available to answer any questions you may have on this
20 project.

21 Thank you.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Thank you.

23 I do have a question.

24 Didn't we already give monies for this type of
25 study to the Indian Wells Tennis Garden facility for

1 research in biodegradable products?

2 MS. MORGAN: Yes, that is correct, on a similar
3 but slightly different approach, meaning that the Indian
4 Wells project is looking at large venues and looking at --
5 focusing more on biodegradables and the ability to compost
6 those materials. This has a little bit of a twist. And
7 maybe Trevor can speak a little bit to how this is
8 different.

9 MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Where this is going and how
10 it expands on that -- and it's using that as an initial
11 placeholder. But the audience type and the variability of
12 the vendors we have -- Indian Wells is very focused and
13 they only have a food service element as well as the
14 tennis match. When we're going to the fairs and
15 expositions and the research we're doing there, we're
16 going beyond just that. We're talking in addition to
17 that, the midway, as well as the vendors that are selling
18 several different types of products.

19 Additionally, this project is not only looking at
20 just the food waste, but all materials that are involved
21 in operation of a fair or in any kind of venue that brings
22 individuals together, whether it's an RV show, a boat show
23 and all that where there's many and multiple products
24 coming together that are being both sold and traded, so to
25 speak.

1 So in that avenue we're trying to further expand
2 and look and build on that very focused case study, where
3 it's really just the food and products sold from that end,
4 and expand on that in all the other elements that are
5 being done. And then also further elaborate and expand on
6 other recycling activities that go on within the fair
7 focus of this project area.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Do we have the
9 results of that study from Indian Wells? Has that study
10 been completed?

11 MS. MORGAN: No, that study is a -- it's a
12 two-year project, so we still have another year and a half
13 before we'll actually have results. We hope to use a lot
14 of the information and research from that project to help
15 us with the state fairs. But particular emphasis,
16 building on what Trevor said, because the State fairs,
17 it's, you know, governmental type of entity, it's a
18 different -- so we're hoping through both projects we can
19 really tackle the large venues that we're dealing with
20 statewide. So --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: And with this fair,
22 that would take in more venues than the tennis --

23 MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: That's absolutely correct,
24 yes.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: So it would give

1 you a much bigger variety to work from.

2 MS. MORGAN: Right.

3 MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: That's exactly -- and by
4 going that larger variety, we'll be able to use that
5 and -- as the building example to go into more private and
6 larger venues, working with ARCO Arena and the work
7 they're doing there, because they do have a multi-faceted
8 activities going on there as well.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: All right.

10 Ms. Peace, questions?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay. I would like to
12 move Resolution number 2003-310 and 349 revised,
13 consideration of the contract concept, scope of work and
14 the Department of Food and Agriculture as contractor for
15 the food waste diversion at California fairs Contract
16 (Fiscal Year 2002/2003 Integrated Waste Management Account
17 Fund).

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: And I'll second
19 that. And that's with the corrections that will be made
20 on the revised for the full Board.

21 All right. We'll substitute the previous roll
22 call.

23 All right.

24 MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Will that also be on consent,
25 fiscal?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah, that's fine.

2 MS. VAN KEKERIX: So put this one on --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: It has money in it?

4 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Yes.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: How much money
6 we're talking here?

7 MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: A hundred thousand.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: No, we'll just let
9 the full Board hear it.

10 MS. VAN KEKERIX: Full Board hear this one?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: Yeah.

12 I'm sorry.

13 All right.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER PEACE: Okay. Thank you all,
15 Lorraine, Cara. Thank you.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER WASHINGTON: All right.

17 Committee stands adjourned.

18 (Thereupon the California Integrated Waste
19 Managment Board, Sustainability and
20 Market Development Committee adjourned
21 at 3:00 p.m.)

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
6 foregoing California Integrated Waste Management Board,
7 Sustainability and Market Development Committee meeting
8 was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a
9 Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California,
10 and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

11 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
12 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any
13 way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
15 this 23rd day of June, 2003.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR

24 Certified Shorthand Reporter

25 License No. 10063